



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/910,281	07/19/2001	Peter Robert Foley	CM2492	2076
27752	7590	08/10/2006		
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION WINTON HILL BUSINESS CENTER - BOX 161 6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE CINCINNATI, OH 45224			EXAMINER DELCOTTO, GREGORY R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1751	
DATE MAILED: 08/10/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/910,281

Applicant(s)

FOLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory R. Del Cotto

Art Unit

1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE filed 7/24/06.  
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 51,53,54,56,57,66-68,76-80 and 84-91 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 51,53,54,56,57,66-68,76-80 and 84-91 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☒ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 66-68, 76-80, and 84-91 are pending. Claims 52, 55, 58-65, 69-75, and 81-83 have been canceled. Applicant's arguments and amendments filed 7/24/06 have been entered.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/24/06 has been entered.

#### **Objections/Rejections Withdrawn**

The following objections/rejections set forth in the Office action mailed 4/19/06 have been withdrawn:

The rejection of claims 51, 53, 54, 56-62, 64-68, 72-74, 76-82, and 84-91 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, has been withdrawn.

#### ***Priority***

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application PCT/US00/19619, filed 7/19/00. It is noted that the certified copy of this document has been received and been placed within an Artifact file for the instant case.

Art Unit: 1751

However, a priority has not been granted with respect to PCT/US00/34906 and PCT/US00/20255 since certified copies of these documents have not been received.

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 66-68, 76-79, 84, 85, and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 60-141800 in view of WO 99/24539.

'800 teaches a liquid detergent composition which removes firmly stuck stains formed by degrading oils by heat and oxidation on surfaces of kitchen and kitchen ware. The compositions contain 0.1 to 10% by weight of a swelling clay powder such as montomorillonite, hectorite, etc.; 0.1 to 30% by weight of a solvent such as triethylene glycol, monopropylene glycol monomethyl ether, diethylene glycol monobutyl ether, monopropylene glycol monomethyl ether, etc.; from 1 to 20% by weight of surfactant such as an amine oxide; and 0.5 to 30% by weight of an alkaline agent including monoethanolamine, diethanolamine, etc. Additionally, the compositions may contain other ingredients such as abrasives, perfumes, etc. See Abstract. Examples of suitable surfactants include anionic surfactants, nonionic surfactants including long chain tertiary amine oxides (C12-C14), etc. See page 5, lines 1-20.

'800 does not teach the use of bleaching agents, propylene glycol butyl ether, or a cleaning composition having the specific physical parameters containing bleaching agents, organoamine, a water-miscible solvent, a limited water-miscible solvent, a surfactant, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

'539 teaches a method of softening soil deposited on a hard surface. The method comprises contacting a hard surface having soil with a composition having a soil softening additive incorporated into the composition. The compositions may be formulated at either high or low pH and preferred soil softening additives are amylase enzymes. See Abstract. The hard surface may be plates, glasses, cutlery, pots, pans and other surfaces such as kitchen countertops, sinks. Metal surfaces, tiles, bathtubs,

Art Unit: 1751

floors, etc. See page 3, lines 1-10. The compositions may include one or more buffering agents such as monoethanolamine, diethanolamine, triethanolamine, etc., and the buffering agent may be present from 0.1 to 15% by weight of the composition. See page 14, line 15 to page 15, line 25. Solvents may also be used in the compositions and include ethanol, propanol, benzyl alcohol, propylene glycol butyl ether, diethylene glycol monobutyl ether, etc. See page 18, line 5 to page 22, line 30.

The compositions may also contain a bleaching component such as a peroxygen bleach including percarbonate, perborate, preformed percarboxylic acids, etc. Additionally, the compositions may include a bleach activator such as tetraacetyl ethylene diamine, n-nonanyloxybenzenesulphonate, etc. See page 43, lines 5-30. Also, the compositions may contain bleach catalysts such as transition metal bleach catalysts, etc. The compositions may comprise up to 30% by weight of a bleach and up to 30% by weight of a bleach activator. See page 45, lines 1-15. Also, the compositions may comprise calcium and/or magnesium ions which improves the cleaning of greasy soils for various compositions. See page 46, lines 15-30. Furthermore, a wide variety of other ingredients may be used in the composition including dyes, pigments, perfumes, etc. See page 47, lines 1-15.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a bleaching agent and bleach activator in the composition taught by '800, with a reasonable expectation of success, because '539 teaches the use of a peroxygen bleach and bleach activator in a similar hard surface cleaning

composition and further, '800 teaches the use of various optional hard surface ingredients which would encompass bleaching agents.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to propylene glycol butyl ether in the composition taught by '800, with a reasonable expectation of success, because '539 teaches the equivalence of diethylene glycol monobutyl ether to propylene glycol butyl ether in a similar hard surface cleaning composition and further, '800 teaches the use of diethylene glycol monobutyl ether.

Note that, with respect to the pH and the other physical parameters of the composition as recited by the instant claims, the Examiner asserts that the broad teachings of '800 in combination with '539 would encompass compositions having the same physical parameters of the composition as recited by the instant claims because '800 in combination with '539 suggest compositions containing the same components in the same amounts as recited by the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a cleaning composition having the specific physical parameters containing an organoamine, bleaching agents, a water-miscible solvent, a limited water-miscible solvent, a surfactant, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of '800 in combination with '539 suggests a cleaning composition having the specific physical parameters containing an



Art Unit: 1751

organoamine, bleaching agents, a water-miscible solvent, a limited water-miscible solvent, a surfactant, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 66-68, 76-79, 84, 85, and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000-044990 in view of JP 141,800 and WO99/24539.

'990 teaches a liquid detergent composition for hard surfaces containing 0.01 to 20% by weight of a surfactant, 0.01 to 20% by weight of a solvent, and 3 to 20% by weight of an amine compound. Preferred surfactants include anionic, nonionic, and amphoteric surfactants. Preferred solvents include monopropylene glycol monobutyl ether, monopropylene glycol monopropyl ether, and monopropylene glycol monoethyl ether. Suitable amine compounds include monoethanolamine, diethanolamine, triethanolamine, etc. The pH of the composition is from 10 to 13. See Abstract. Suitable surfactants include anionic surfactants, nonionic surfactants including higher fatty acid alkanolamides, alkyl or alkenylamine oxide, etc. See page 5, lines 1-30. The pH of the composition is preferably from 10 to 13. See page 9, lines 1-10.

'990 does not teach the use of a water-miscible solvent such as diethylene glycol monobutyl ether, bleaching agents, or a cleaning composition having the specific physical parameters containing an organoamine, bleaching agents, a water-miscible solvent, a limited water-miscible solvent, a surfactant, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

'800 and '539 are relied upon as set forth above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a solvent such as diethylene glycol monobutyl ether in the composition taught by '990, with a reasonable expectation of success, because '800 teaches the equivalence of diethylene glycol monobutyl ether to monopropylene glycol monomethyl ether in a similar cleaning composition and further, '990 teaches the use of monopropylene glycol monoethyl ether.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a bleaching agent and bleach activator in the composition taught by '990, with a reasonable expectation of success, because '539 teaches the use of a peroxygen bleach and bleach activator in a similar hard surface cleaning composition and further, '990 teaches the use of various optional hard surface ingredients.

Note that, with respect to the specific physical parameters of the composition as recited by the instant claims, the Examiner asserts that the broad teachings of '990 in combination with '800 and '539 would encompass compositions having the same physical parameters of the composition as recited by the instant claims because '990 in combination with '800 and '539 suggests compositions containing the same components in the same amounts as recited by the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a cleaning composition having the specific physical parameters containing an organoamine, bleaching agents, a water-miscible solvent, a

limited water-miscible solvent, a surfactant, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of '990 in combination with '800 and '539 suggest a cleaning composition having the specific physical parameters containing an organoamine, bleaching agents, a water-miscible solvent, a limited water-miscible solvent, a surfactant, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Claim 86 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 141800 in view of WO 99/24539 or JP 2000-044990 in view of JP 141800 and WO 99/24539 as applied to the rejected claims above, and further in view of Ofosu-Asante (US 5,739,092).

'800 or '990 are relied upon as set forth above. However, '800 or '990 do not teach the use of a divalent cation in addition to the other requisite components of the composition as recited by instant claim 86.

Ofosu-Asante teaches liquid or gel dishwashing detergent compositions containing alkyl ethoxy carboxylate surfactant, calcium or magnesium ions, etc. See Abstract. The presence of calcium or magnesium ions improves the cleaning of greasy soils for compositions, manifest mildness to the skin, and provide good storage stability. See column 6, lines 40-55.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a magnesium or calcium ion(s) in the cleaning compositions

taught by '800 or '990 in combination with '800, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Ofosu-Asante teaches the advantageous properties imparted to a similar hard surface cleaner when using magnesium and/or calcium ions.

Claims 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 66-68, 76-79, and 84-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 99/24539.

'539 is relied upon as set forth above.

However, '539 does not teach, with sufficient specificity, a cleaning composition having the specific physical parameters containing an organoamine, bleaching agents, a water-miscible solvent, a limited water-miscible solvent, a surfactant, divalent ions, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Note that, with respect to the specific physical parameters of the composition as recited by the instant claims, the Examiner asserts that the broad teachings of '539 would encompass compositions having the same physical parameters of the composition as recited by the instant claims because "539 teaches compositions containing the same components in the same amounts as recited by the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a cleaning composition having the specific physical parameters containing an organoamine, bleaching agents, a water-miscible solvent, a limited water-miscible solvent, a surfactant, divalent ions, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to

Art Unit: 1751

other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of '539 suggest a cleaning composition having the specific physical parameters containing an organoamine, bleaching agents, a water-miscible solvent, a limited water-miscible solvent, a surfactant, divalent ions, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 88-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 141800 in view of WO 99/24539, JP 2000-044990 in view of JP 141800 and WO 99/24539, or WO 99/14539 as applied to the rejected claims above, and further in view of Trinh et al (US 6,001,789).

'800, '990, and '539 are relied upon as set forth above. However, '800, '990, or '539 do not specifically teach the use of ionone perfumes, musk, or cyclodextrin in addition to the other requisite components of the composition as recited by the instant claims.

Trinh et al teach a cleaning composition in which a perfumes including ionones and musks are absorbed into a cyclodextrin carrier material to form complexes. See abstract and col. 7, line 35 to col. 12, line 55.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a perfume-cyclodextrin complex in the cleaning composition taught by '800, '990, or '539, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Trinh et al teach the use of a perfume-cyclodextrin complex a similar cleaning composition and further, '800, '990, or '539 teach the use of perfumes in general.

Claim 80 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 60-141800 in view of WO 99/24539, JP 2000-044990 in view of JP 141,800 and WO99/24539, or WO 99/24539 as applied to the rejected claims above, and further in view of Culshaw et al (US 5,202,050).

'800, '990, and '539 are relied upon as set forth above. However, none of the references teach the use of a synthetic smectite clay in addition to the other requisite components of the composition as recited by the instant claims.

Culshaw et al teach safe and effective hard-surface cleaning compositions which contain a binary mixture of an organic solvent and a narrowly defined chelating agent. See Abstract. Suitable organic solvents include benzyl alcohol, 2-(2-butoxyethoxy)ethanol, 1-(2-n-butoxy-1-methylethoxy)propane-2-ol, etc., and can be used in amounts of from 1% to 20%. See column 5, lines 1-30. In addition to the essential chelating agent/solvent binary mixture, the compositions can contain additional ingredients such as surfactants and suitable surfactants include anionic, nonionic, cationic, amphoteric, and zwitterionic surfactants. See column 5, lines 45-69. Also, thickeners may be used in the compositions in amounts from 0.2% to 1.5% and include xanthan gums, smectite clays, etc. See column 6, lines 55-69. Highly desirable ingredients for use include hydrotropes such as monoethanolamine, diethanolamine, triethanolamine, etc. See column 6, lines 15-35. The pH of such compositions will generally be in the range of from 5 to 11. See column 7, lines 50-60.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use xanthan gum in the cleaning composition taught by '800,

Art Unit: 1751

with a reasonable expectation of success, because Culshaw et al teach the equivalence of smectite clays to xanthan gum in a similar cleaning composition and further, '800 teaches the use of thickening agents such as swellable clay minerals including smectite clay minerals.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use xanthan gum as a thickener in the cleaning composition taught by '990 or '539, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Culshaw et al teach the use of xanthan gum as a thickener in a similar cleaning composition and further, '539 teaches the use of thickening agents in general and '990 teaches the use of various optional components which would encompass conventionally well known additives such as thickening agents.

### ***Response to Arguments***

With respect to the rejections under 35 USC 103 of the instant claims over JP 60-141800 in view of WO 99/24539, JP 2000-044990 in view of JP 141-800 and WO 99/24539, and WO 99/24539, Applicant states that none of the references or any combination of references teaches or suggests the use of a three solvent system in the amounts claimed and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine three solvents to arrive at the claimed invention of the present application. In response, with respect to JP 60-141800 in view of WO 99/24539, '800 teaches the use of monoethanolamine and diethylene glycol monobutyl ether. The Examiner asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly have been motivated to use propylene glycol butyl ether in the composition taught by '800, with a reasonable expectation of success,

Art Unit: 1751

because '539 teaches the equivalence of diethylene glycol monobutyl ether to propylene glycol butyl ether in a similar hard surface cleaning composition and further, '800 teaches the use of diethylene glycol monobutyl ether.

With respect to JP 2000-044990 in view of JP 141-800 and WO 99/24539, the Examiner asserts that '990 teaches the use of monoethanolamine and propylene glycol butyl ether. The Examiner asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly have been motivated to use diethylene glycol monobutyl ether in the composition taught by '990, with a reasonable expectation of success, because '800 teaches the equivalence of diethylene glycol monobutyl ether to monopropylene glycol monomethyl ether in a similar cleaning composition and further, '990 teaches the use of monopropylene glycol monoethyl ether.

With respect to '539, the Examiner asserts that '539 teaches the use of monoethanolamine, propylene glycol butyl ether, and diethylene glycol monobutyl ether as set forth above. Note that, with respect to the mixture of diethylene glycol monobutyl ether and propylene glycol butyl ether with monoethanolamine as recited by the instant claims, the Examiner asserts that the prior art teaches the equivalency of both diethylene glycol monobutyl ether and propylene glycol butyl ether as solvents; it is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions, each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose...[T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art. In re Kerkhoven, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980).



***Conclusion***

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Remaining references cited but not relied upon are considered to be cumulative to or less pertinent than those relied upon or discussed above.

Applicant is reminded that any evidence to be presented in accordance with 37 CFR 1.131 or 1.132 should be submitted before final rejection in order to be considered timely.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/910,281  
Art Unit: 1751

Page 17

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gregory R. Del Cotto', written in a cursive style.

Gregory R. Del Cotto  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1751

GRD  
April 12, 2006